S.P. C.M. 643 exaggerated claims, without counting Turkey which is today the proprietor of the contested territory, without speaking of the Great Powers, especially Russia, Italy, and Austria, who have their eye on Macedonia.

000 From all of this whirlpool of literary, political, and scientific endeavors, a disinterested observer can draw today only these obvious conclusions:

S.P. C.M. 181 1). The Slavs of Macedonia and of Old Serbia represent a people whose national consciousness is not yet completely and equally developed, if we compare them with the two neighboring nations. However, it is beyond doubt that the largest portion of this people S.P. C.M. [795] feel themselves and proclaim themselves to be Bulgars, that they belong to the independent Bulgarian Church, whose head is the Exarch resident at Ortakioi. (1) On the other hand, it is certain that the

1. According to Brankov, there are in Macedonia 77% Exarchists and 23% Patriarchists. According to Hilmi, the proportion is entirely different. See above in Section 37.[1]

name Bulgars is an historic name in these regions and that it has not been brought in through the religious propaganda of these recent years. Even though these regions were once annexed to the Serbian State, yet the name Serb has not taken root among the people. This is why in recent times the Bulgarian propoganda, both ecclesiastical and political, has found a very deep response throughout the country; Serbian propoganda has a chance of future success only in the northern region which is in contact with the Serbian Kingdom and has direct dealings with it; this region is Old Serbia.

S.P. C.M. 197 2). From a philological point of view it is true that the language of the Slavs of Macedonia presents an aggregation of local dialects rather distinct from one another. They form a sort of idiom which is intermediate between the Serbian stokavski and the Bulgarian language proper. (1) But taken altogether and in certain details it is much more

1. See Section 32, above.[2]

S.P. C.M. [194 -195] closely related to the Bulgarian than to the Serbian. These special traits are the use of the postpositive article (used after the substantive), the loss of declension and the retention of the nasals. Only the dialect of the northern region is more closely related to the dialect group of Vranje, Nish, Timok, which Profesessor Belic assigns to the domain of the Serbian language, but certain philologists do not agree with him.

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Serbocroatian, and some Bulgarian dialects where ъ and ь in strong position coalesced into *ə* or *a*, the strong ъ in all languages became *e*, while ъ changed to *o* in the whole Eastern Slavic area, in Macedonia, partly also in High Sorbian and Central Slovak; everywhere else it changed to a corresponding unrounded vowel which later in 2 and 3 (but never in 4) coalesced with *e*. The vocalic phonemes of 4 are determined by the opposition of rounded and unrounded; and to the South moreover, the unrounded series splits into front and back: both for the higher and for the lower vowels the Ukrainian and the Bulgarian phonemic pattern distinguishes (a) unrounded front, (b) unrounded back, (c) rounded (back). The change of long vowels into decrescent diphthongs occurs only in the Western borderland of the Slavic world—in Czech, Polabian, and Kashubian.

In various regions of the Slavic world—in some Russian, Polish, Sorbian, and Serbocroatian dialects—the hushing and the corresponding hissing affricates, or generally sibilants, coalesced. A rare phoneme, the sibilant vibrant *r*, formerly common to the majority of the Western Slavic languages, is maintained in Czech and Kashubian.

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

THE AUTONOMY of the word and the markedness of word boundaries are preserved both in Protoslavic and in the modern Slavic languages; and there is a clear-cut difference between the treatment of affixes on one hand, and proclitic conjunctions or enclitic particles on the other. The root plus derivational and inflectional suffixes forms a simple word. A root preceded by another root or by a prefix produces a complex word. Prepositions are phonemically treated as prefixes. Derivational suffixes remain an extremely productive means for neology in Slavic languages. Prefixes play only a derivational role but prefixation as such has an important part in the building of Slavic verbal aspects. Alternations of phonemes are relevant auxiliary means in Slavic inflection; pivotal are prosodic alternations both in Protoslavic and in those Slavic languages which maintain in their word structure such

193 distinctive features as pitch, quantity, or place of accent; as a result of the loss of the 'jers' alternations of vowel and zero as well as zero desinences occupy a great place in all Slavic languages. Autonomous alternations of different vowels in the root are in part the residue of Indo-European or Protoslavic processes, and in part essential innovations of separate Slavic languages, e.g., Ukrainian, Polish, Czech. In desinences vocalic alternations conditioned by the stem-end (a characteristic feature of late Protoslavic), remain, in spite of all analogic changes, a pertinent factor in the morphologic structure of modern Slavic languages. Due to various palatalization processes, the alternations of the last stem-consonant are partly inherited from Protoslavic, partly developed in the separate Slavic languages. There is still a pronounced tendency (particularly striking in Russian) to differentiate the alternations used in declension and those used in conjugation.

193 Protoslavic preserved the Indo-European system of cases (Nom.,
197 Acc., Instr., Dat., Gen., Loc.), losing only the ablative which merged with the genitive—the latter took over the ablative desinence for *o*-stems. The use of *m* in the Instr. and Dat. desinences links Slavic with the Baltic and Germanic area. The nominal declension exhibits a strong influence from the pronominal, an interaction of different paradigms, and a tendency to identify paradigms with genders. The impulse to unify the declension continues in separate Slavic languages. All of them tend to eliminate the prepositionless use of the Loc. and of the Dat. of destination. The substitution of the possessive Gen. for the original possessive adjective is widespread. Western and Eastern Slavic languages developed a predicative Instr. Bulgarian and Macedonian, for the most part, have lost declension (as well as the suffixal comparative forms of the adjectives) and developed instead a postpositive article. Distinction of single cases, weakened both formally and functionally in Sorbian, Czech, Slovenian, and Serbocroatian, is firmly held in the other Slavic languages and even enriched by two new cases (Gen. 2 and Loc. 2) in Russian, and the general meanings of the cases remain here distinctly delimited (e.g., the persistence of the Gen. of negation perfectly fits the general meaning of the genitive

as a purely restrictive case). The vocative form is preserved in all Slavic languages except Russian and Slovenian. 193 197

A sharp distinction between the singular and the plural unvaryingly goes through the whole Slavic inflection, whereas the dual, still vital in the Slavic medieval world, died out but for Slovenian, Sorbian, and Slovincian. Residues of the old nominal dual serve to denote nouns after numerals from 'two' to 'four' in Russian and Serbocroatian, and after all numerals in Bulgarian which, along with declension, lost the clear-cut Slavic difference between the substantivized numerals from 'five' and the lower numerals consistently adjectivized. Slavic substantives and adjectives still strikingly distinguish masculine, feminine, and neuter in the singular; in the plural, however, these distinctions are lost by Russian and Bulgarian and tend to weaken as well elsewhere. The difference between the animate and inanimate started for the Acc. Sg. M. in late Protoslavic and became generalized for some other cases in Western Slavic languages, and for the Acc. Pl. in Russian. Bulgarian, Western Slavic languages (particularly Polish and Sorbian), and Ukrainian tend to promote a new, personal gender.

For the adjectives Protoslavic developed a new, definite form which distinguishes more clearly their declension from that of the substantives. In Serbocroatian and Slovenian the difference between the definite and indefinite forms is more or less preserved and marked by prosodic alternations; Bulgarian and Macedonian have reduced the use of the definite form, whereas Byelo-Russian, Ukrainian, and Western Slavic languages tend to eliminate the indefinite doublet; Russian has changed it into a purely predicative, indeclinable form.

The Protoslavic verb had been more essentially reshaped than the noun. Only the forms of the present tense continue closely an Indo-European prototype; the forms of the aorist are perceptibly refashioned, while the forms of the Slavic imperfect have nothing in common with the Indo-European stock. Neither the form nor the function of the Indo-European perfect find correspondence in the Slavic. Besides two sets of simple forms—the sequential past (the so-called 'aorist') and the synchronic past (the so-called 'imperfect'), Slavic created new, compound pasts: the retrospective

193
197
past (inadequately called the 'perfect'), and three pluperfects corresponding to the aorist, the imperfect, and the perfect. Protoslavic abolished the Indo-European subjunctive and innovated a compound conditional. The Indo-European optative was re-formed into an imperative, whereas the old imperative disappeared completely. The middle voice became obsolete and its functions were partly assumed by the Slavic (and Baltic) construction with the enclitic Acc. of the reflexive pronoun which had been generalized for all persons; besides, a periphrastic passive was developing with verbal adjectives changed into participles. The nominal forms of the verb, the infinitive and supine, are due to a convergent development in the Slavic and some other Indo-European dialects. Partly paralleled by the Baltic, Protoslavic developed a system of coupled verbs of perfective (denoting the completion of a process) and imperfective (without such denotation) aspect; of the imperfective verbs a few couples denote the opposition of determined (characterizing the process as an uninterrupted whole) and undetermined aspect. The future was usually expressed by either the present of perfective verbs or different periphrastic constructions with imperfective verbs. Various types of impersonal constructions were developed with a zero-subject and a verb in 3rd pers. Sg. or Pl. as predicate. Conjugation drew upon two stems, one full and another truncated, chiefly regular in their alternation (depending on the vocalic or consonantal onset of the desinence)—a feature which has persisted for the most part to the present time.

This rich set of verbal forms (in Old Church Slavonic an imperfective verb had up to 236 forms, without counting the compound ones) persisted fundamentally through the Middle Ages. Later, most of the Slavic languages generalized the original 'perfect' as the only past; the imperfect and the aorist have been kept only in Sorbian on the one hand, and in Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Serbocroatian on the other. These same Southern Slavic languages stabilized the use of the verb *xotěti* 'want' for the compound future and generalized this construction for the perfective verbs as well, somewhat dampening (as Sorbian also does) the opposition of the aspects. Bulgarian and Macedonian have developed the richest

9: Jakobson L-4 (no date) 1955 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

pattern of finite forms with a consistent opposition of direct and indirect narration. Fundamentally, the Protoslavic pattern of aspects, voices, and moods is preserved in all Slavic languages. The imperative becomes (especially in Russian and Ukrainian) a bare stem, agglutinating autonomous suffixes phonemically treated as particles. The supine remained only in Low Sorbian and Slovenian. The infinitive is lost in Bulgarian and Macedonian. Participles tended at an early date to do away with declension and to become gerunds—in the Eastern and partly also in the Western Slavic area they even lost gender and number.

Enclitics traditionally followed the first accented word, but in languages with free stress the inflected enclitics were attracted by the governing word and then completely eliminated in the whole Eastern Slavic area, except for Western Ukrainian dialects: in the reflexive verbs the pronoun became an inseparable suffix; the other pronominal enclitic forms, richly developed in Protoslavic, were lost; the auxiliary verb as used in the 3rd pers. Sg. Neutr. of the compound forms was generalized (in the conditional *by* and in the pluperfect *bylo* became mere particles); in the 'perfect' the pres. 3rd pers. zero-form of the auxiliary verb *byti* 'be,' when used for all persons, changed the 'perfect' into a simple form. Subsequently the present of *byti* was likewise omitted in its other functions and the use of the correlative verb *iměti* 'have' essentially reduced; the abolishment of the copula favored asyndeton; finally, in personal constructions the use of pronouns, which was pleonastic for the Slavic pattern, became normal and their omission, which was normal for the Slavic pattern, became elliptic.

Word order underwent some alterations in the separate development of the Slavic languages. Particularly the verb tends to a medial position in the sentence and the place of attributes depends on regional changes in the system of definite and indefinite adjectives. Generally, word order is still based on the same principles as in Protoslavic: there is one basic pattern and a set of usual deviations each of which possesses a distinct semantic or stylistic value. In the spoken Slavic languages hypotaxis is weakly developed and less used than parataxis. The evolution of Slavic languages shows an extreme instability of conjunctions and relative pronouns.